



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

The Elements of Sociology. By FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS, Ph. D.
Pp. vii, 353. Price, \$1.10. New York: The Macmillan Company,
1898.

By the publication of his "Elements of Sociology," Professor Giddings has advanced the science a stage beyond that at which he left it in his earlier works. "The Principles of Sociology" was more like a series of essays in a new field than a complete treatise. It may not be amiss to compare it with Hume's social and moral essays, which had so great an influence on the views and method of Adam Smith. Valuable as these essays were, they did not create a science, but merely prepared the way for more systematic work. While Professor Giddings' new work is more modest in form than its predecessor, it is more pretentious in content. He is no longer trying to point out what the field and content of sociology should be but what it really is. There is no discussion of the relation of sociology to other sciences. He confines himself strictly to a statement of the sociological doctrines that have been advanced and have acquired at least a provisional place in the science. Sometimes the reader is startled by the bold way in which new doctrines are stated. The book in many places has a Ricardian ring. Professor Giddings has a positive creed and teaches doctrines, the import of which cannot be mistaken. His clearness and directness are in refreshing contrast to the great array of loose statements and fanciful analogies that have been passed off as sociology.

Now that we have a sociology with an actual content, we can compare it with the other social sciences that have a recognized place in the school-room and see whether it is to displace or supplement them. Two recent books by the same publisher show the tendencies in economics and politics and help to determine just what field each of those sciences really occupies. I do not suppose that Professor Giddings would admit that the scope of sociology is to be determined by the content of his book but the practical question for the teacher is whether or not this book displaces or supplements the books now in use. The answer plainly is that the "Elements of Sociology" does not at all enter the fields occupied by Devine's "Economics" and by Ford's "American Politics." It treats of problems that they neglect. The teacher must also neglect them or use Professor Giddings' book.

If Devine's "Economics" be taken as representing present tendencies among economists (I neglect their theoretical statements as I have done those of the sociologists), the scope of economics has been much narrowed by the emphasis of marginal utility. Economic

theories are bolder than they were, but they cover less ground. The emphasis of consumption also narrows the field of economics, because it takes the attention away from social affairs. Consumption is individual and a study of it leads to an analysis of personal motives and desires. Society is lost sight of when the palates, stomachs and æsthetic feelings of men become the supreme object of study. When these investigations are complete, economists naturally turn to the environment and seek to discover the methods of production that will lead to the most complete satisfaction of men's desires. Both these tendencies are prominent in Devine's "Economics," and because of them there is but little of government or society. Two fields are thus left for others to cultivate. No economist would now think of writing a political economy covering the field occupied by Mill's great work, Mill separated economics from social and political affairs much more consciously than did Adam Smith. Whatever may be the theories of economists their work now occupies a very definite field. Professor Ward, in the March ANNALS (p. 88), quotes Mill to prove that political economy deals exclusively with the production of wealth. It is a little hard on economists to have their science determined for them by a writer of fifty years ago, no matter how eminent he may have been. Yet it must be admitted that there is much truth in this view of economics. The emphasis of production has been distinct and for good reasons. Utilities and consumption have never been out of the mind of the economists, but they have been thinking too much of *produced* utilities and thus neglected other sources of happiness. The emphasis of production turned the attention naturally to the cost of production, and hence the pains connected with work were made more prominent than the pleasures of consumption. Economics thus came to be a philosophy of work without any treatment of leisure. Enjoyable goods were talked of to the neglect of enjoyable relations.

The value of Professor Giddings' new book lies in the fact that he treats of these topics neglected by the economists. This may or may not be the proper field for sociology, but it is a useful field and one that schools and colleges can no longer afford to neglect. Were I to define the book I would call it a philosophy of friendliness, because it emphasizes so strongly the value of good relations between men and the psychic effects that these friendly relations produce. It might also be called a philosophy of leisure, because it treats of what men do in their leisure hours quite as consciously as books on economics treat of men at work. Professor Giddings nowhere says that society is created and developed by men's activities while at leisure, but I infer he would lay greater stress on play, sport and other social

enjoyments than on the pressure of the economic environment. If this is true there will be no practical opposition between sociologists and economists. The tendencies of their respective fields will take them farther and farther apart, no matter how much ground they may individually attempt to cover.

University of Pennsylvania.

S. N. PATTEN.

Evolution of the Aryan. By RUDOLPH VON JHERING. Translated from the German. 8vo. Price, \$3.00. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1898.

The genius of Jhering for importing life and character into the remote past, so strikingly exhibited in his "*Geist des Römischen Rechts*" and his "*Zweck im Recht*," is to be seen reflected in the pages of his "*Vorgeschichte der Indo-Europäer*," accessible to English readers in the "Evolution of the Aryan," an English translation by A. Drucker, M. P.*

It may be admitted that the period covered by the book is so vast and so obscure, and, it may be said without danger of extravagance, so impenetrable, that Jhering is safe against successful criticism so far forth as antagonistic *facts* may go. There are hypotheses which, in the absence of recoverable facts, but, in the light of recovered evidences, are unsound. And this seems to be the one fault of Jhering's book.

The sources of his inspiration respecting the Aryans, in their original home, are Zimmer (*Alt Indisches Leben*), Schrader (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*), and Heyn (*Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*). While admitting that some respectable opinion is the other way, he casts his vote in favor of the views of the majority and places the original habitat of the Aryans in Bactria or Central Asia. From this source he thinks the Aryans migrated to the seats of their later permanent settlements, stopping for several centuries by the way and taking their tremendous journey by easy stages which, in a grand total, covered over a thousand years.

Now if it should turn out, after all, that the probabilities are against a location in Central Asia, and such a wonderful migration, and that this so-called migration was only a movement of tribes, as tribes often move, from place to place, either because of restlessness or pressure from contiguous regions, all of this hypothesis of Jhering, and the structure which he built upon it, would fall to pieces.†

* The translation is taken as the basis of this review.

† Cp. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, Book I and Book IV, Chap. XIV; Taylor, *Origin of the Aryan*, 52; Meitzen, *Siedlung und Agrarw.*, Vol. II, Chap. XIII.